IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of **Carlsson** et al.	)	
Serial No.: **09/828,864**	)	PATENT PENDING
Filed: **April 10, 2001**	)	Examiner: Chuong T. Ho
For: **Wireless Network Architecture for GPRS Over 30kHz Channels**	)	Group Art Unit: 2616
Docket No: **4015-5117**	)	Confirmation No.:6952

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

☒ e-filed with the USPTO.

☐ transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.

May 26, 2006
Date

Kathleen Koppen

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

This paper is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2006. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks below. While no fees should be required for entry of this response, if any fees or charges are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge them to Deposit Account 18-1167.

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 47 and 51 as being anticipated by Mooney (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,723). Mooney discloses a communication system comprising both a circuit-switched network and packet-switched network. The problem addressed by Mooney is how to route signaling messages to a home location register when the mobile station has only a single mobile directory number (MDN). Conventionally, location requests are routed to the home location register based on the MDN of the mobile station. However, the conventional routing method does not work where the circuit-switched network and packet-switched network have different home location registers. Mooney solves this problem by routing messages based on the type of the upper layer protocol employed in the SCCP message.

Mooney does not disclose an interworking function as recited in claim 1. In fact, there is no interworking at al between the circuit-switched network and packet-switched network in Mooney. In Mooney, both networks connect to a common signaling network. However, there is no mechanism for routing packet data between the circuit-switched and packet-switched networks. In fact, Mooney fails to disclose any mechanism whatsoever for routing packet data to a mobile station operating in the circuit-switched network.

Claims 47 and 51 both recite a teleservice server for transferring packet data to and from a mobile station operating in a circuit-switched network, such as a TIA/EIA-136 network. Because the system of Mooney does not allow routing of packet data between the circuit-switched and packet-switched networks, Mooney does not anticipate claims 47 and 56. The rejections of the dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 fail for the same reasons.

For the foregoing reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.

Dated: May 26, 2006

David E. Bennett
Registration No.: 32,194

P.O. Box 5
Raleigh, NC 27602
Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084